

# New lower bounds on nonnegative rank using conic programming

Hamza Fawzi

Pablo A. Parrilo

October 25th, 2012

## Abstract

The nonnegative rank of an entrywise nonnegative matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$  is the smallest integer  $r$  such that  $A$  can be written as  $A = UV$  where  $U \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times r}$  and  $V \in \mathbb{R}_+^{r \times n}$  are both nonnegative. The nonnegative rank arises in different areas such as combinatorial optimization and communication complexity. Computing this quantity is NP-hard in general and it is thus important to find efficient bounding techniques especially in the context of the aforementioned applications.

In this paper we propose a new lower bound on the nonnegative rank which, unlike existing lower bounds, does not explicitly rely on the matrix sparsity pattern and applies to nonnegative matrices with arbitrary support. Our lower bound is expressed as the solution of a copositive programming problem and can be relaxed to obtain polynomial-time computable lower bounds using semidefinite programming. The idea involves computing a certain nuclear norm with nonnegativity constraints which allows to lower bound the nonnegative rank, in the same way the standard nuclear norm gives lower bounds on the standard rank. We compare our lower bound with existing ones, and we show examples of matrices where our lower bound performs better than currently known ones.

## 1 Introduction

Given a nonnegative<sup>1</sup> matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$ , the *nonnegative rank* of  $A$  is the smallest integer  $r$  such that  $A$  can be factorized as  $A = UV$  where  $U \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times r}$  and  $V \in \mathbb{R}_+^{r \times n}$  are both nonnegative. The nonnegative rank of  $A$  is denoted by  $\text{rank}_+(A)$  and it is always contained between  $\text{rank}(A)$  and  $\min(n, m)$ :

$$\text{rank}(A) \leq \text{rank}_+(A) \leq \min(n, m).$$

---

The authors are with the Laboratory for Information and Decision Systems, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139. Email: {hfawzi, parrilo}@mit.edu.

<sup>1</sup>Throughout the paper, a nonnegative matrix is a matrix whose entries are all nonnegative.

The nonnegative rank appears in different areas such as in combinatorial optimization [Yan91] and communication complexity [KN06, Lov90, LS09]. Indeed, in combinatorial optimization a well-known result by Yannakakis [Yan91] shows that the nonnegative rank of a suitable matrix characterizes the smallest number of linear inequalities needed to represent a given polytope  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . This quantity is very important in practice since it indicates whether linear programs over the polytope  $P$  can be solved efficiently or not (the complexity of algorithms such as interior-point methods explicitly depend on the number of linear inequalities in the linear program). Another application of the nonnegative rank is in communication complexity where one is interested in the minimum number of bits that need to be exchanged between two parties in order to compute a binary function  $f(x, y)$ , assuming that initially each party holds only one of the two arguments of the function. This quantity is known as the communication complexity of  $f$  and is tightly related to the nonnegative rank of a suitable matrix constructed from the function  $f$  [LS09, Lov90]. Finally it was also recently observed [Zha10, JSWZ12] that the logarithm of the nonnegative rank of a matrix  $A$  coincides exactly with the minimum number of bits that need to be exchanged between two parties in order to sample from the bivariate probability distribution  $p(x, y) = A_{x,y}$  represented by the matrix  $A$  (assuming  $A$  is normalized so that  $\sum_{x,y} A_{x,y} = 1$ ).

Unfortunately, the nonnegative rank is NP-hard to compute in general [Vav09], unlike the standard rank. Researchers have therefore developed techniques to find lower and upper bounds for this quantity. Existing lower bounds are not entirely satisfactory though, since in general they depend only on the sparsity pattern of the matrix  $A$  and not on the actual values of the entries; see e.g. [LS09, FKPT11]. As a consequence, the bounds may fail in general when all the entries of  $A$  are strictly positive. In fact most of the currently known lower bounds are actually lower bounds on the *rectangle covering number* (also known as the *Boolean rank*) which is a purely combinatorial notion of rank that is itself a lower bound on the nonnegative rank. The *rectangle covering number* of a nonnegative matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$  is the smallest number of rectangles needed to cover the nonzero entries of  $A$ . More precisely it is the smallest integer  $r$  such that there exist rectangles  $R_i = I_i \times J_i \subseteq [m] \times [n]$  for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  such that

$$\text{support}(A) = \bigcup_{i=1}^r R_i,$$

where  $\text{support}(A) = \{(i, j) \in [m] \times [n] : A_{i,j} \neq 0\}$  is the set of indices of the nonzero entries of  $A$ . It is easy to see that the rectangle covering number is always smaller than or equal to the nonnegative rank of  $A$  (each nonnegative rank 1 term in a decomposition of  $A$  corresponds to a rectangle). Some of the well-known lower bounds on the nonnegative rank such as the fooling set method or the rectangle size method are in fact lower bounds on the rectangle covering number and they only depend on the sparsity pattern of  $A$  and not on the specific values of its entries.

In this paper we present the first computable lower bound on the nonnegative rank that does not rely on the sparsity pattern and that is applicable to matrices that are strictly positive. Before we present our result, recall that a symmetric matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is said to be *copositive* if  $x^\top M x \geq 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ . Our result can be summarized in the following:

**Theorem 1.** Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$  be a nonnegative matrix. Let  $\nu_+(A)$  be the optimal value of the following optimization program:

$$\nu_+(A) = \max_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \left\{ \langle A, W \rangle : \begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^\top & I \end{bmatrix} \text{ copositive} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Then we have

$$\text{rank}_+(A) \geq \left( \frac{\nu_+(A)}{\|A\|_F} \right)^2, \quad (2)$$

where  $\|A\|_F := \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} A_{i,j}^2}$  is the Frobenius norm of  $A$ .

As presented, the lower bound of Equation (2) is difficult to compute since copositive programming is known to be NP-hard in general (see e.g., [Dür10]). Fortunately however, copositive programs can be nicely approximated using semidefinite programming. For example one can obtain a lower bound to  $\nu_+(A)$  by solving the following semidefinite program:

$$\nu_+^{[0]}(A) = \max_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \left\{ \langle A, W \rangle : \begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^\top & I \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{N}^{n+m} + \mathcal{S}_+^{n+m} \right\}$$

where  $\mathcal{S}_+^{n+m}$  denotes the cone of symmetric positive semidefinite matrices of size  $n+m$ , and  $\mathcal{N}^{n+m}$  denotes the cone of symmetric nonnegative matrices of size  $n+m$ . Since in general the sum of a nonnegative matrix and a positive semidefinite matrix is copositive, we immediately see that  $\nu_+(A) \geq \nu_+^{[0]}(A)$  for any  $A$ , and thus this yields a polynomial-time computable lower bound to  $\text{rank}_+(A)$ :

$$\text{rank}_+(A) \geq \left( \frac{\nu_+^{[0]}(A)}{\|A\|_F} \right)^2$$

One can in fact obtain tighter estimates of  $\nu_+(A)$  using semidefinite programming by considering hierarchies of relaxations of the copositive cone, like e.g., the hierarchy developed in [Par00]. This is discussed in more detail later in the paper.

It is interesting to express the dual of the copositive program (1). The dual of the cone of copositive matrices is the cone of completely positive matrices. A symmetric matrix  $M$  is said to be *completely positive* if it admits a factorization  $M = BB^\top$  where  $B$  is elementwise nonnegative. Note that a completely positive matrix is both nonnegative and positive semidefinite; however not every such matrix is necessarily completely positive (see e.g., [BSM03] for an example and for more information on completely positive matrices). The dual of the copositive program (1) defining  $\nu_+(A)$  is the following completely positive program (both programs give the same optimal value by strong duality):

$$\nu_+(A) = \min_{\substack{X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} \\ Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(\text{trace}(X) + \text{trace}(Y)) : \begin{bmatrix} X & A \\ A^\top & Y \end{bmatrix} \text{ completely positive} \right\}$$

We will revisit this completely positive program later in the paper in Section 2.2 when we discuss the relation between the quantity  $\nu_+(A)$  and the nuclear norm.

**Outline** The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we give the proof of the lower bound of Theorem 1 and we also outline a connection between the quantity  $\nu_+(A)$  and the nuclear norm of a matrix. We then discuss computational issues and we see how to obtain semidefinite programming relaxations of the quantity  $\nu_+(A)$ . In Section 3 we look at specific examples of matrices and we show that our lower bound can be greater than the currently known lower bounds (i.e., the plain rank lower bound and the rectangle covering number). In general however our lower bound is uncomparable to the existing lower bounds, i.e., it can be either greater or smaller. Among the examples we show that our lower bound is exact for the slack matrix of the hypercube, thus giving another proof that the extension complexity of the hypercube in  $n$  dimensions is equal to  $2n$  (a combinatorial proof of this fact is given in [FKPT11]).

**Notations** Throughout the paper  $\mathcal{S}^n$  denotes the vector space of symmetric matrices of size  $n$  and  $\mathcal{S}_+^n$  is the cone of positive semidefinite matrices of size  $n$ . The cone of nonnegative matrices of size  $m \times n$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{N}^{m \times n}$  (for square symmetric matrices of size  $n$  we simply write  $\mathcal{N}^n$ ). If  $X \in \mathcal{S}^n$  we write  $X \succeq 0$  to say that  $X$  is positive semidefinite. Given two matrices  $X$  and  $Y$ , their inner product is defined as  $\langle X, Y \rangle = \text{trace}(X^\top Y) = \sum_{i,j} X_{i,j} Y_{i,j}$ .

## 2 The lower bound

### 2.1 Proof of the lower bound

In this section we prove the lower bound of Theorem 1 in a slightly more general form:

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$  be a nonnegative matrix. Assume  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  and  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  are nonnegative symmetric matrices with strictly positive diagonal entries. Let  $\nu_+(A; P, Q)$  be the optimal value of the following copositive program:*

$$\nu_+(A; P, Q) = \max_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \left\{ \langle A, W \rangle : \begin{bmatrix} P & -W \\ -W^\top & Q \end{bmatrix} \text{ copositive} \right\} \quad (3)$$

Then we have

$$\text{rank}_+(A) \geq \left( \frac{\nu_+(A; P, Q)}{\sqrt{\text{trace}(A^\top P A Q)}} \right)^2. \quad (4)$$

Note that Theorem 1 in the Introduction corresponds to the special case where  $P$  and  $Q$  are the identity matrices. The more general lower bound of Theorem 2 has the advantage of being invariant under diagonal scaling: namely if  $\tilde{A} = D_1 A D_2$  is obtained from  $A$  by positive diagonal scaling (where  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  are positive diagonal matrices), then the lower bound produced by the previous theorem for both quantities  $\text{rank}_+(A)$  and  $\text{rank}_+(\tilde{A})$  (which are equal) will coincide, for adequate choices of  $P$  and  $Q$ . In fact it is easy to verify that if we choose  $P = D_1^{-2}$  and  $Q = D_2^{-2}$  then

$$\left( \frac{\nu_+(\tilde{A}; P, Q)}{\sqrt{\text{trace}(\tilde{A}^\top P \tilde{A} Q)}} \right)^2 = \left( \frac{\nu_+(A)}{\|A\|_F} \right)^2.$$

The dual of the copositive program defining  $\nu_+(A; P, Q)$  is the following completely positive program where the matrices  $P$  and  $Q$  enter as weighting matrices in the objective function:

$$\nu_+(A; P, Q) = \min_{\substack{X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} \\ Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(\text{trace}(PX) + \text{trace}(QY)) : \begin{bmatrix} X & A \\ A^\top & Y \end{bmatrix} \text{ completely positive} \right\}.$$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* We introduce the shorthand notations  $\|x\|_P = \sqrt{x^\top P x}$  when  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$  and  $\|y\|_Q = \sqrt{y^\top Q y}$  when  $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  which are well defined by the assumptions on  $P$  and  $Q$  (note however that  $\|\cdot\|_P$  and  $\|\cdot\|_Q$  are not necessarily norms in the usual sense). Let  $A$  be an  $m \times n$  nonnegative matrix with nonnegative rank  $r$  and consider a factorization of  $A$  of the form  $A = UV$  where  $U \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times r}$  and  $V \in \mathbb{R}_+^{r \times n}$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , let  $u_i = U_{:,i}/\|U_{:,i}\|_P \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$  be the  $i$ 'th column of  $U$  normalized so that  $\|u_i\|_P = 1$ , and  $v_i = V_{i,:}/\|V_{i,:}\|_Q$  be the  $i$ 'th row of  $V$  normalized so that  $\|v_i\|_Q = 1$ . Then we can write  $A = \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i u_i v_i^\top$  where  $\|u_i\|_P = \|v_i\|_Q = 1$  and  $\lambda_i = \|U_{:,i}\|_P \|V_{i,:}\|_Q \geq 0$ . We know by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$\text{rank}_+(A) = r \geq \left( \frac{\|\lambda\|_1}{\|\lambda\|_2} \right)^2 = \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i^2}} \right)^2$$

We will now show separately that the numerator  $\|\lambda\|_1^2$  is lower bounded by the quantity  $\nu_+(A; P, Q)^2$ , and that the denominator  $\|\lambda\|_2^2$  is upper bounded by  $\text{trace}(A^\top P A Q)$ :

- Numerator: If  $W$  is such that  $\begin{bmatrix} P & -W \\ -W^\top & Q \end{bmatrix}$  is copositive then, since  $u_i, v_i \geq 0$ , we have:

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_i \\ v_i \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} P & -W \\ -W^\top & Q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_i \\ v_i \end{bmatrix} \geq 0$$

and hence

$$u_i^\top W v_i \leq \frac{1}{2}(\|u_i\|_P^2 + \|v_i\|_Q^2) = 1.$$

Thus we get

$$\langle A, W \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i u_i v_i^\top, W \right\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i u_i^\top W v_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i.$$

Note that this is true for any  $W$  such that  $\begin{bmatrix} P & -W \\ -W^\top & Q \end{bmatrix}$  is copositive and thus we obtain

$$\nu_+(A; P, Q) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i.$$

- Denominator: We now turn to find an upper bound on  $\sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i^2$ . Observe that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{trace}(A^\top P A Q) &= \langle P A, A Q \rangle = \sum_{i,j=1}^r \langle \lambda_i P u_i v_i^\top, \lambda_j u_j v_j^\top Q \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i^2 \|u_i\|_P^2 \|v_i\|_Q^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} \lambda_i \lambda_j (u_i^\top P u_j) (v_j^\top Q v_i) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i^2 \|u_i\|_P^2 \|v_i\|_Q^2 = \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i^2 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that  $u_i^\top P u_j \geq 0$  and  $v_j^\top Q v_j \geq 0$  which is true since  $P$  and  $Q$  are nonnegative.

Now if we combine the two points above we finally get the desired inequality

$$\text{rank}_+(A) = r \geq \left( \frac{\|\lambda\|_1}{\|\lambda\|_2} \right)^2 \geq \left( \frac{\nu_+(A; P, Q)}{\sqrt{\text{trace}(A^\top P A Q)}} \right)^2.$$

□

## 2.2 Connection with nuclear norm

In this section we discuss the connection between the quantity  $\nu_+(A)$  and nuclear norms of linear operators [Jam87]. If  $A$  is an arbitrary (not necessarily nonnegative) matrix the *nuclear norm* of  $A$  is defined by:

$$\nu(A) = \min \left\{ \sum_i \|u_i\|_2 \|v_i\|_2 : A = \sum_i u_i v_i^\top \right\} \quad (5)$$

It can be shown that the quantity  $\nu(A)$  above is equal to the sum of the singular values  $\sigma_1(A) + \dots + \sigma_r(A)$  of  $A$ , and in fact this is the most commonly encountered definition of nuclear norm. This latter characterization gives the following well-known lower bound on  $\text{rank}(A)$  combining  $\nu(A)$  and  $\|A\|_F$ :

$$\text{rank}(A) \geq \left( \frac{\sigma_1(A) + \dots + \sigma_r(A)}{\sqrt{\sigma_1(A)^2 + \dots + \sigma_r(A)^2}} \right)^2 = \left( \frac{\nu(A)}{\|A\|_F} \right)^2$$

The characterization of nuclear norm given in Equation (5) can be very easily adapted to nonnegative factorizations of  $A$  by restricting the vectors  $u_i$  and  $v_i$  in the decomposition of  $A$  to be nonnegative. The new quantity that we obtain with this restriction is in fact nothing but the quantity  $\nu_+(A)$  introduced earlier, as we show in the Theorem below. Observe that this quantity  $\nu_+(A)$  is always greater than or equal than the standard nuclear norm  $\nu(A)$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$  be a nonnegative matrix. The following three quantities are equal to  $\nu_+(A)$  as defined in Equation (1):*

- (1)  $\min \left\{ \sum_i \|u_i\|_2 \|v_i\|_2 : A = \sum_i u_i v_i^\top, u_i, v_i \geq 0 \right\}$
- (2)  $\min_{\substack{X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} \\ Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(\text{trace}(X) + \text{trace}(Y)) : \begin{bmatrix} X & A \\ A^\top & Y \end{bmatrix} \text{ completely positive} \right\}$
- (3)  $\max_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \left\{ \langle A, W \rangle : \begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^\top & I \end{bmatrix} \text{ copositive} \right\}$

*Proof.* The conic programs in (2) and (3) are dual of each other and equality of their optimal values follows from strong duality (both programs are easily seen to be strictly feasible). We thus have to show only that (1) and (2) are equal.

We start by proving that (1)  $\leq$  (2): If  $A = \sum u_i v_i^\top$ , then if we let

$$X = \sum_i \frac{\|v_i\|_2}{\|u_i\|_2} u_i u_i^\top \quad \text{and} \quad Y = \sum_i \frac{\|u_i\|_2}{\|v_i\|_2} v_i v_i^\top$$

then

$$\begin{bmatrix} X & A \\ A^\top & Y \end{bmatrix} = \sum_i \|u_i\|_2 \|v_i\|_2 \begin{bmatrix} u_i/\|u_i\|_2 \\ v_i/\|v_i\|_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_i/\|u_i\|_2 \\ v_i/\|v_i\|_2 \end{bmatrix}^\top$$

and so  $\begin{bmatrix} X & A \\ A^\top & Y \end{bmatrix}$  is completely positive since  $u_i$  and  $v_i$  are elementwise nonnegative. Furthermore we have

$$\text{trace}(X) + \text{trace}(Y) = \sum_i \|u_i\|_2 \|v_i\|_2 + \sum_i \|u_i\|_2 \|v_i\|_2 = 2 \sum_i \|u_i\|_2 \|v_i\|_2.$$

Hence this shows that (1)  $\leq$  (2).

We now show that (2)  $\leq$  (1). Assume that  $X$  and  $Y$  are such that  $\begin{bmatrix} X & A \\ A^\top & Y \end{bmatrix}$  is completely positive and consider a decomposition

$$\begin{bmatrix} X & A \\ A^\top & Y \end{bmatrix} = \sum_i \begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ y_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_i \\ y_i \end{bmatrix}^\top$$

where  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  are nonnegative. Then from this decomposition we have  $A = \sum_i x_i y_i^\top$  and

$$\sum_i \|x_i\|_2 \|y_i\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_i \|x_i\|_2^2 + \sum_i \|y_i\|_2^2 \right) = \frac{1}{2} (\text{trace}(X) + \text{trace}(Y)).$$

This shows that (2)  $\leq$  (1) and completes the proof.  $\square$

Observe that for an arbitrary (not necessarily nonnegative) matrix  $A$  the solution of the primal-dual pair of SDPs

$$\begin{array}{l|l} \begin{array}{l} \text{minimize} \\ X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} \\ Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \end{array} & \frac{1}{2} (\text{trace}(X) + \text{trace}(Y)) \\ \text{subject to} & \begin{bmatrix} X & A \\ A^\top & Y \end{bmatrix} \text{ positive semidefinite} \end{array} \quad \left| \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{maximize} \\ W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \end{array} \quad \langle A, W \rangle \right. \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^\top & I \end{bmatrix} \text{ positive semidefinite} \end{array} \quad (6)$$

can be obtained from the singular value decomposition of  $A$ . Namely if  $A = U \Sigma V^\top$  is a singular value decomposition of  $A$ , then  $X = U \Sigma U^\top$ ,  $Y = V \Sigma V^\top$  and  $W = UV^\top$  are optimal points of the SDPs above. An interesting question is to know whether the primal-dual pairs (2)-(3) of completely positive/copositive programs in Theorem 3 lead to a specific nonnegative factorization of  $A$  with interesting properties like the SVD. In the next proposition we explore such properties and we give a relation between the optimal  $W$  of the copositive program and an optimal nonnegative decomposition  $A = \sum_i u_i v_i^\top$  satisfying  $\sum_i \|u_i\|_2 \|v_i\|_2 = \nu_+(A)$ .

**Proposition 1.** Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$  be a nonnegative matrix. Assume  $A = \sum_i \lambda_i u_i v_i^T$  is a nonnegative decomposition of  $A$  that satisfies

$$\sum_i \lambda_i = \nu_+(A)$$

where  $\lambda_i \geq 0$  and  $u_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^m, v_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  have unit norm  $\|u_i\|_2 = \|v_i\|_2 = 1$ . Let  $W$  be an optimal point in the copositive program (1). Then we have for all  $i$ ,

$$u_i = \Pi_+(W v_i) \quad \text{and} \quad v_i = \Pi_+(W^T u_i)$$

where  $\Pi_+(x) = \max(x, 0)$  is the projection on the nonnegative orthant.

The proposition above translates in the nonnegative world the fact that, for arbitrary matrices  $A$ , the optimal  $W$  in the semidefinite program (6) satisfies  $u_i = W v_i$  and  $v_i = W^T u_i$  where  $u_i$  and  $v_i$  are respectively the left and right singular vectors of  $A$ .

Before proving the proposition we prove the following simple lemma:

**Lemma 1.** If  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  is such that  $\begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^T & I \end{bmatrix}$  is copositive, then for any  $v \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  we have

$$\|\Pi_+(W v)\|_2 \leq \|v\|_2$$

where  $\Pi_+(x) = \max(x, 0)$  is the projection on the nonnegative orthant.

*Proof.* Let  $v \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  and call  $u = \Pi_+(W v)$ . By the copositivity assumption we have, since  $u$  and  $v$  are nonnegative:

$$\begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^T & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix} \geq 0$$

which can be rewritten as:

$$(u - W v)^T (u - W v) + v^T (I - W^T W) v \geq 0.$$

Since  $u = \Pi_+(W v)$  we get:

$$\|\Pi_+(W v) - W v\|_2^2 + \|v\|_2^2 - \|W v\|_2^2 \geq 0.$$

Note that  $\|\Pi_+(W v) - W v\|_2^2 - \|W v\|_2^2 = -\|\Pi_+(W v)\|_2^2$  and thus we get the desired inequality

$$\|\Pi_+(W v)\|_2^2 \leq \|v\|_2^2.$$

□

Using this lemma we now prove Proposition 1:

*Proof of Proposition 1.* Let  $A = \sum_i \lambda_i u_i v_i^T$  be a nonnegative decomposition of  $A$  that satisfies  $\sum_i \lambda_i = \nu_+(A)$  and let  $W$  be an optimal point of the copositive program (1). Since

$\begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^\top & I \end{bmatrix}$  is copositive and  $\|u_i\|_2 = \|v_i\|_2 = 1$ , we have for each  $i$ ,  $u_i^\top W v_i \leq 1$ . Now since  $W$  is optimal we have

$$\sum_i \lambda_i u_i^\top W v_i = \langle A, W \rangle = \nu_+(A) = \sum_i \lambda_i,$$

and hence for each  $i$  we have necessarily  $u_i^\top W v_i = 1$ . Furthermore, we have the sequence of inequalities

$$1 = u_i^\top W v_i \leq u_i^\top \Pi_+(W v_i) \leq \|u_i\|_2 \|\Pi_+(W v_i)\|_2 \leq \|u_i\|_2 \|v_i\|_2 = 1 \quad (7)$$

where in the first inequality we used that  $u \geq 0$ , then we used Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and for the third inequality we used Lemma 1. Since the left-hand side and the right-hand side of (7) are equal this shows that all the intermediate inequalities are in fact equalities. In particular by the equality case in Cauchy-Schwarz we have that  $\Pi_+(W v_i) = \rho_i u_i$  for some constant  $\rho_i$ . But since  $u_i^\top \Pi_+(W v_i) = 1$  and  $\|u_i\|_2 = 1$  we get that  $\rho_i = 1$ . This shows finally that  $u_i = \Pi_+(W v_i)$ . To prove that  $v_i = \Pi_+(W^\top u_i)$  we use the same line of inequalities as in (7) starting from the fact that  $1 = v_i^\top W^\top u_i$ .  $\square$

## 2.3 Relaxations and semidefinite programming lower bounds

In this section we describe how one can use semidefinite programming to obtain polynomial-time computable lower bounds on  $\nu_+(A)$ , and thus on  $\text{rank}_+(A)$ . We outline here the hierarchy of relaxations of the copositive cone proposed by Parrilo in [Par00] which is a particular instance of a sums-of-squares relaxation.

Recall that a symmetric matrix  $M \in \mathcal{S}^n$  is copositive if  $x^\top M x \geq 0$  for all  $x \geq 0$ . An equivalent way of formulating this condition is to say that the following polynomial of degree 4

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n M_{i,j} x_i^2 x_j^2$$

is globally nonnegative. The cone  $\mathcal{C}$  of copositive matrices can thus be described as:

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ M \in \mathcal{S}^n : \text{the polynomial } \sum_{i,j=1}^n M_{i,j} x_i^2 x_j^2 \text{ is nonnegative} \right\}.$$

The  $k$ 'th order relaxation of  $\mathcal{C}$  proposed by Parrilo in [Par00] is defined as:

$$\mathcal{C}^{[k]} = \left\{ M \in \mathcal{S}^n : \left( \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 \right)^k \left( \sum_{i,j=1}^n M_{i,j} x_i^2 x_j^2 \right) \text{ is a sums-of-squares} \right\}. \quad (8)$$

It is clear that for any  $k$  we have  $\mathcal{C}^{[k]} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  and also  $\mathcal{C}^{[k]} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{[k+1]}$ , which shows that the sequence  $(\mathcal{C}^{[k]})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  forms a sequence of tighter and tighter inner approximations to the cone of copositive matrices. A crucial property of this hierarchy is that each cone  $\mathcal{C}^{[k]}$  can be represented using linear matrix inequalities, which means that optimizing a linear function

over any of these cones is equivalent to a semidefinite program (the size of the semidefinite program will of course increase as  $k$  increases). An interesting feature concerning this hierarchy is that the relaxation of order  $k = 0$  corresponds to

$$\mathcal{C}^{[0]} = \mathcal{N}^n + \mathcal{S}_+^n,$$

i.e.,  $\mathcal{C}^{[0]}$  is the set of matrices that can be written as the sum of a nonnegative matrix and a positive semidefinite matrix (this particular relaxation was already mentioned in the introduction).

Using these semidefinite programming relaxations, we can now compute lower bounds to  $\text{rank}_+(A)$  using semidefinite programming:

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$  be a nonnegative matrix. For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\nu_+^{[k]}(A)$  be the optimal value of the following semidefinite programming problem:*

$$\nu_+^{[k]}(A) = \max \left\{ \langle A, W \rangle : \begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^T & I \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{C}^{[k]} \right\} \quad (9)$$

where the cone  $\mathcal{C}^{[k]}$  is defined in Equation (8). Then we have

$$\text{rank}_+(A) \geq \left( \frac{\nu_+^{[k]}(A)}{\|A\|_F} \right)^2 \quad (10)$$

where  $\|A\|_F := \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} A_{i,j}^2}$  is the Frobenius norm of  $A$ .

As said earlier, for the level  $k = 0$  we have  $\mathcal{C}^{[0]} = \mathcal{N}^n + \mathcal{S}_+^n$  and so the quantity  $\nu_+^{[0]}(A)$  takes the more explicit form:

$$\nu_+^{[0]}(A) = \max \left\{ \langle A, W \rangle : \begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^T & I \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{N}^{n+m} + \mathcal{S}_+^{n+m} \right\} \quad (11)$$

As  $k$  gets larger the quantity  $(\nu_+^{[k]}(A)/\|A\|_F)^2$  will converge (from below) to  $(\nu_+(A)/\|A\|_F)^2$  (where  $\nu_+(A)$  is defined by the copositive program (1)) and this quantity can be strictly smaller than  $\text{rank}_+(A)$  as can be seen for instance in Example 6 given later in the paper. In general, the quantity  $(\nu_+^{[k]}(A)/\|A\|_F)^2$  may not converge to  $\text{rank}_+(A)$ , however it will always be a valid lower bound to  $\text{rank}_+(A)$ . In summary, we can write for any  $k \geq 0$ :

$$\nu(A) \leq \nu_+^{[0]}(A) \leq \nu_+^{[k]}(A) \leq \nu_+(A) \leq \sqrt{\text{rank}_+(A)} \|A\|_F$$

where  $\nu(A)$  is the standard nuclear norm of  $A$ . The lower bounds (10) are thus always greater than the lower bound that use the standard nuclear norm (in fact they can also be greater than the standard rank lower bound as we show in the examples later).

The MATLAB script [http://www.mit.edu/~hfawzi/lower\\_bound\\_nonnegative\\_rank.m](http://www.mit.edu/~hfawzi/lower_bound_nonnegative_rank.m) allows to compute the quantity  $\nu_+^{[k]}(A)$  and the associated lower bound on  $\text{rank}_+(A)$  for any nonnegative matrix  $A$  and relaxation order  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . The script uses the software YALMIP and its Sums-Of-Squares module in order to compute the quantity  $\nu_+^{[k]}(A)$  [Löf04, Löf09].

Note that there is another relaxation of the copositive cone that has been proposed by de Klerk and Pasechnik in [KP02]. This relaxation is based on linear programming (instead of semidefinite programming) and it leads in general to smaller programs that can be solved more efficiently. However the convergence of the LP hierarchy is in general much slower than the SDP hierarchy and one typically needs to take large values of  $k$  (the hierarchy level) to obtain interesting bounds.

**Program size reduction when  $A$  is symmetric** If the nonnegative matrix  $A$  is square and symmetric, the semidefinite programs that define  $\nu_+^{[k]}(A)$  can be simplified to obtain smaller optimization problems that are easier to solve. For simplicity, we describe below in detail the case of  $k = 0$ ; the extensions to the general case can also be done. Recall that the (dual) program defining  $\nu_+^{[0]}(A)$  is:

$$\text{minimize } \frac{1}{2}(\text{trace}(X) + \text{trace}(Y)) \text{ subject to } \begin{bmatrix} X & A \\ A & Y \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{S}_+^{2n} \cap \mathcal{N}^{2n}$$

where  $\mathcal{S}_+^{2n} \cap \mathcal{N}^{2n}$  is the cone of symmetric matrices that are positive semidefinite and non-negative (also known as *doubly nonnegative*). When  $A$  is symmetric, one can always find an optimal solution of the SDP above where  $X = Y$ . Indeed if the matrix  $\begin{bmatrix} X & A \\ A & Y \end{bmatrix}$  is feasible, then so is the matrix  $\begin{bmatrix} Y & A \\ A & X \end{bmatrix}$  which also achieves the same objective function and thus by averaging we get a feasible point with the same matrices on the diagonal and with the same objective function. Therefore for symmetric  $A$ , the quantity  $\nu_+^{[0]}(A)$  is given by the optimal value of:

$$\text{minimize } \text{trace}(X) \text{ subject to } \begin{bmatrix} X & A \\ A & X \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{S}_+^{2n} \cap \mathcal{N}^{2n}$$

Now using the known fact that

$$\begin{bmatrix} X & A \\ A & X \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \Leftrightarrow X - A \succeq 0 \text{ and } X + A \succeq 0$$

we can rewrite the program as:

$$\text{minimize } \text{trace}(X) \text{ subject to } X - A \succeq 0, X + A \succeq 0, X \text{ nonnegative}$$

This new program has two smaller positivity constraints, each of size  $n$ , and thus can be solved more efficiently than the previous definition which involved one large positivity constraint of size  $2n$ .

One can also obtain a reduction for the *primal* program that defines  $\nu_+^{[0]}(A)$ , and this is given by:

$$\text{maximize } \text{trace}(AW) \text{ subject to } R - W \succeq 0, R + W \succeq 0, I - R \text{ nonnegative} \quad (12)$$

Observe that the constraint in the program above implies that  $\begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^\top & I \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{S}^{2n} + \mathcal{N}^{2n}$  since:

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W & I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I - R & 0 \\ 0 & I - R \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} R & -W \\ -W & R \end{bmatrix}$$

where in the right-hand side the first matrix is nonnegative and the second one is positive semidefinite.

### 3 Examples

In this section we apply our lower bound to some explicit matrices and we compare it to existing lower bounding techniques.

**Example 1.** We start with an example where our lower bound exceeds the plain rank lower bound. Consider the following  $4 \times 4$  nonnegative matrix from [CR93]:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

The rank of this matrix is 3 and its nonnegative rank is 4 as was noted in [CR93]. We can compute the exact value of  $\nu_+^{[0]}(A)$  for this matrix  $A$  and we get  $\nu_+^{[0]}(A) = 4\sqrt{2} \approx 5.65$ . We thus see that the lower bound is sharp for this matrix:

$$4 = \text{rank}_+(A) \geq \left( \frac{\nu_+^{[0]}(A)}{\|A\|_F} \right)^2 = \left( \frac{4\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{8}} \right)^2 = 4.$$

The optimal matrix  $W$  in the semidefinite program<sup>2</sup> (11) for which  $\nu_+^{[0]}(A) = \langle A, W \rangle$  is given by:

$$W = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(2A - J) \quad (13)$$

Observe that the matrix  $W$  is obtained from  $A$  by replacing the ones with  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$  and the zeros with  $-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ . The matrix  $W$  is feasible for the semidefinite program (11) and we have the following decomposition of  $\begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^\top & I \end{bmatrix}$  into a nonnegative part and a positive semidefinite part:

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^\top & I \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}}_{\text{nonnegative}} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{array}{c} -W \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array}}_{\text{positive semidefinite}} \quad (14)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Note that the matrix considered in this example is symmetric, and so one could use the reduced semidefinite program (12) to simplify the computation of  $\nu_+^{[0]}(A)$ . However for simplicity and for illustration purposes, we used in this example the original formulation (11).

**Example 2** (Slack matrix of the hypercube). The  $4 \times 4$  matrix of the previous example is in fact the slack matrix of the square  $[0, 1]^2$  in the plane. Recall that the slack matrix of a polytope  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $f$  facet inequalities  $b_i - a_i^\top x \geq 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, f$  and  $v$  vertices  $x_1, \dots, x_v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the  $f \times v$  matrix  $S(P)$  given by:

$$S(P)_{i,j} = b_i - a_i^\top x_j \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, f, j = 1, \dots, v.$$

The matrix  $S(P)$  is clearly nonnegative since the vertices  $x_j$  belong to  $P$  and satisfy the facet inequalities. Yannakakis showed in [Yan91] that the nonnegative rank of  $S(P)$  coincides with the smallest number of linear inequalities needed to represent the polytope<sup>3</sup>  $P$ . The minimal number of linear inequalities needed to represent  $P$  is also known as the extension complexity of  $P$ ; the theorem of Yannakakis therefore states that  $\text{rank}_+(S(P))$  is equal to the extension complexity of  $P$ .

The hypercube  $[0, 1]^n$  in  $n$  dimensions has  $2n$  facets and  $2^n$  vertices. It is known that the extension complexity of the hypercube is equal to  $2n$  and this was proved recently in [FKPT11, Proposition 5.9] using a combinatorial argument (in fact it was shown that any polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  that is combinatorially equivalent to the hypercube has extension complexity  $2n$ ). Note that the trivial lower bound obtained from the rank of the slack matrix in this case is  $n + 1$ ; in fact for any full-dimensional polytope  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , the rank of the slack matrix of  $P$  is equal to  $n + 1$  (see e.g., [GRT12, Lemma 3.1]) and so the trivial rank lower bound is in general not interesting in the context of slack matrices of polytopes.

Below we use the lower bound on the nonnegative rank introduced in this paper to give another proof that the extension complexity of the hypercube in  $n$  dimensions is  $2n$ .

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $C_n = [0, 1]^n$  be the hypercube in  $n$  dimensions and let  $S(C_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2^n}$  be its slack matrix. Then*

$$\text{rank}_+(S(C_n)) = \left( \frac{\nu_+^{[0]}(S(C_n))}{\|S(C_n)\|_F} \right)^2 = 2n.$$

*Proof.* The proof is given in appendix A. □

**Example 3** (Matrix with strictly positive entries). Consider the following matrix with strictly positive entries ( $\epsilon > 0$ ):

$$A_\epsilon = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \epsilon & 1 + \epsilon & \epsilon & \epsilon \\ 1 + \epsilon & \epsilon & 1 + \epsilon & \epsilon \\ \epsilon & 1 + \epsilon & \epsilon & 1 + \epsilon \\ \epsilon & \epsilon & 1 + \epsilon & 1 + \epsilon \end{bmatrix}$$

which is obtained from the matrix of Example 1 by adding a constant  $\epsilon > 0$  to each entry. For  $\epsilon = 0.1$ , we can compute the lower bound of Equation (10) with relaxation order  $k = 0$

---

<sup>3</sup>Note that the trivial representation of  $P$  uses  $f$  linear inequalities, where  $f$  is the number of facets of  $P$ . However by introducing new variables (i.e., allowing projections) one can sometimes reduce dramatically the number of inequalities needed to represent  $P$ . For example the cross-polytope  $P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : w^\top x \leq 1 \ \forall w \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$  has  $2^n$  facets but can be represented using only  $2n + 1$  linear inequalities after introducing  $n$  additional variables:  $P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \exists y \in \mathbb{R}^n \ y \geq x, y \geq -x, 1^\top y \leq 1\}$ .

and we get that

$$\text{rank}_+(A_{0.1}) \geq \left( \frac{\nu_+^{[0]}(A_{0.1})}{\|A_{0.1}\|_F} \right)^2 \approx 3.2$$

which shows that  $\text{rank}_+(A_{0.1}) = 4$ . Note that the only existing nontrivial lower bound for strictly positive matrices is the plain rank lower bound and for the matrix  $A_{0.1}$  we have  $\text{rank}(A_{0.1}) = 3$ .

**Example 4** (Comparison with the Boolean rank lower bound). We now show an example where the lower bound  $(\nu_+^{[0]}(A)/\|A\|_F)^2$  is strictly greater than the rectangle covering lower bound (i.e., Boolean rank lower bound). Consider the  $4 \times 4$  matrix

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that the rectangle covering number of  $A$  is 2 since  $\text{support}(A)$  can be covered with the two rectangles  $\{1, 2\} \times \{2, 3, 4\}$  and  $\{2, 3, 4\} \times \{1, 2\}$ . If we compute the quantity  $\nu_+^{[0]}(A)$  and the associated lower bound we get  $\text{rank}_+(A) \geq \lceil (\nu_+^{[0]}(A)/\|A\|_F)^2 \rceil = 3$  which is strictly greater than the rectangle covering number. In fact  $\text{rank}_+(A)$  is exactly equal to 3 since we have the factorization

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The following simple proposition concerning diagonal matrices will be needed for the next example:

**Proposition 3.** *If  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a nonnegative diagonal matrix and  $P$  is a diagonal matrix with strictly positive elements on the diagonal, then*

$$\nu_+(A; P, P) = \langle A, P \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n A_{i,i} P_{i,i}.$$

*In particular, for  $P = I$  we get  $\nu_+(A) = \text{trace}(A)$ .*

*Proof.* We first show that  $\nu_+(A; P, P) \leq \langle A, P \rangle$ : Observe that if  $W$  is such that  $\begin{bmatrix} P & -W \\ -W & P \end{bmatrix}$  is copositive, then we must have  $W_{i,i} \leq P_{i,i}$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  (indeed, take  $e_i$  to be the  $i$ 'th element of the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then by copositivity we must have  $2e_i^\top P e_i - 2e_i^\top W e_i \geq 0$  which gives  $W_{i,i} \leq P_{i,i}$ ). Hence, since  $A$  is diagonal we have  $\langle A, W \rangle \leq \langle A, P \rangle$  for all feasible matrices  $W$  and thus  $\nu_+(A; P, P) \leq \langle A, P \rangle$ . Now if we take  $W = P$ , we easily see that  $\begin{bmatrix} P & -W \\ -W & P \end{bmatrix}$  is copositive, and thus  $\nu_+(A; P, P) \geq \langle A, P \rangle$ . Thus we conclude that  $\nu_+(A; P, P) = \langle A, P \rangle$ .  $\square$

**Example 5** (Matrix rescaling). The well-known lower bound on the rank

$$\text{rank}(A) \geq \left( \frac{\sigma_1(1) + \dots + \sigma_r(A)}{\sqrt{\sigma_1(A)^2 + \dots + \sigma_r(A)^2}} \right)^2$$

is sharp when all the singular values of  $A$  are equal, but it is loose when the matrix is not well-conditioned. The same phenomenon is expected to happen also for the lower bound of Theorem 1 on the nonnegative rank, even if it is not clear how to define the notion of condition number in the context of nonnegative matrices. If one considers the following diagonal matrix where  $\beta > 0$

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \beta & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n},$$

then we have from Proposition 3,  $\nu_+(A) = \text{trace}(A) = \beta + n - 1$ , and thus for the lower bound we get:

$$\text{rank}_+(A) \geq \left( \frac{\nu_+(A)}{\|A\|_F} \right)^2 = \left( \frac{\beta + n - 1}{\sqrt{\beta^2 + n - 1}} \right)^2.$$

If  $\beta$  is large and grows with  $n$ , say for example  $\beta = n$ , the lower bound on the right-hand side is  $\leq O(1)$  whereas  $\text{rank}_+(A) = n$ .

To fix this one can use the more general lower bound of Theorem 2 with weight matrices  $P$  and  $Q$  to obtain a better lower bound, and in fact a sharp one. Indeed, if we let

$$P = Q = \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

then we have  $\nu_+(A; P, Q)^2 = (n - 1 + \beta\epsilon)^2$  and  $\text{trace}(A^\top P A Q) = n - 1 + (\beta\epsilon)^2$ . Hence for  $\epsilon = 1/\beta$ , the ratio  $\left( \frac{\nu_+(A; P, Q)}{\sqrt{\text{trace}(A^\top P A Q)}} \right)^2$  is equal to  $n$  which is equal to  $\text{rank}_+(A)$ .

**Example 6** (Derangement matrix). We now consider another example of a matrix that is not well-conditioned and where the lower bound of Theorem 1 is loose. Consider the derangement matrix

$$D_n = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 1 \\ 1 & \dots & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

that has zeros on the diagonal and ones everywhere on the off-diagonal entries. Then we have  $\text{rank}_+(D_n) = \text{rank}(D_n) = n$ , but we will show that

$$\left( \frac{\nu_+(D_n)}{\|D_n\|_F} \right)^2 \leq 4$$

for all  $n$ . Observe that the matrix  $D_n$  is not well-conditioned since it has one singular value equal to  $n - 1$  while the other remaining singular values are all equal to 1.

To show that the lower bound of Theorem 1 is always bounded above by 4, note that the quantity  $\nu_+(D_n)$  in this case is given by:

$$\nu_+(D_n) = \max \left\{ \sum_{i \neq j} W_{i,j} : \begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^\top & I \end{bmatrix} \text{ copositive} \right\}$$

Observe that by symmetry, one can restrict the matrix  $W$  in the program above to have the form<sup>4</sup>:

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} a & b & \dots & b \\ b & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & b \\ b & \dots & b & a \end{bmatrix} = bJ_n + (a - b)I_n$$

where  $J_n$  is the  $n \times n$  all ones matrix. For  $W$  of the form above we have for  $u$  and  $v$  arbitrary vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $u^\top W v = (a - b)u^\top v + b(1^\top u)(1^\top v)$  and hence the condition that  $\begin{bmatrix} I_n & -W \\ -W^\top & I_n \end{bmatrix}$  is copositive means that

$$\forall u, v \in \mathbb{R}_+^n, \quad (a - b)u^\top v + b(1^\top u)(1^\top v) \leq \frac{1}{2}(u^\top u + v^\top v)$$

Hence the quantity  $\nu_+(D_n)$  can now be written as:

$$\nu_+(D_n) = \max_{a, b \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ (n^2 - n)b : \forall u, v \in \mathbb{R}_+^n, (a - b)u^\top v + b(1^\top u)(1^\top v) \leq \frac{1}{2}(u^\top u + v^\top v) \right\}$$

Let us call  $b_n$  the largest  $b$  in the problem above, so that  $\nu_+(D_n) = (n^2 - n)b_n$ . Assuming  $n$  is even let

$$u_n = (\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{n/2}, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \quad \text{and} \quad v_n = (0, \dots, 0, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{n/2}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

Then we have  $u_n^\top v_n = 0$  and the optimal  $b_n$  must satisfy  $b_n(1^\top u_n)(1^\top v_n) \leq \frac{1}{2}(u_n^\top u_n + v_n^\top v_n)$ , which gives  $b_n \frac{n^2}{4} \leq \frac{n}{2}$ , i.e.,  $b_n \leq 2/n$ . Hence  $\nu_+(D_n) \leq (n^2 - n) \cdot 2/n = 2(n - 1)$  and

$$\left( \frac{\nu_+(D_n)}{\|D_n\|_F} \right)^2 \leq \frac{4(n - 1)^2}{n^2 - n} = 4(1 - 1/n) \leq 4.$$

The case when  $n$  is odd can be treated the same way and we also obtain the same upper bound of 4.

---

<sup>4</sup>Indeed, observe first that the optimal  $W$  can be taken to be symmetric. Then for any feasible symmetric  $W$  and any permutation  $\sigma$ , the new matrix  $W'_{i,j} = W_{\sigma(i), \sigma(j)}$  is also feasible and has the same objective function as  $W$ . Hence by averaging we can assume  $W$  to be constant on the diagonal and constant on the off-diagonal.

## 4 Conclusion

In this paper we have presented new lower bounds on the nonnegative rank that can be computed using semidefinite programming. Unlike previously known bounds, our lower bounds do not directly depend on the sparsity pattern of the matrix and are applicable to matrices with strictly positive entries.

An interesting first question is to know whether the techniques presented here can be strengthened to obtain sharper lower bounds. In particular the results given here rely on the ratio of the  $\ell_1$  and the  $\ell_2$  norms, however it is known that the ratio of the  $\ell_1$  and the  $\ell_p$  norms for  $1 < p < 2$  can yield better lower bounds. Another interesting question is to know if the quantity  $\nu_+(A)$  introduced in this paper can be related to *approximate nonnegative factorizations* or *approximate nonnegative rank*.

A further direction that we are currently investigating are extensions of the techniques introduced in this paper to obtain lower bounds on the *positive semidefinite (psd) rank*. The psd rank was recently introduced in [GPT11], and has important applications in optimization [GPT11, FMP<sup>+</sup>12], quantum communication complexity [FMP<sup>+</sup>12] and quantum information [JSWZ12].

## A Proof of Proposition 2: Slack matrix of hypercube

In this appendix we prove Proposition 2 concerning the nonnegative rank of the slack matrix of the hypercube. We restate the proposition below for convenience:

**Proposition.** *Let  $C_n = [0, 1]^n$  be the hypercube in  $n$  dimensions and let  $S(C_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2^n}$  be its slack matrix. Then*

$$\text{rank}_+(S(C_n)) = \left( \frac{\nu_+^{[0]}(S(C_n))}{\|S(C_n)\|_F} \right)^2 = 2n.$$

*Proof.* The facets of the hypercube  $C_n = [0, 1]^n$  are given by the linear inequalities  $\{x_k \geq 0\}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n$  and  $\{x_k \leq 1\}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , and the vertices of  $C_n$  are given by the set  $\{0, 1\}^n$  of binary words of length  $n$ . It is easy to see that the slack matrix of the hypercube is a 0/1 matrix: in fact, for a given facet  $F$  and vertex  $V$ , the  $(F, V)$ 'th entry of  $S(C_n)$  is given by:

$$S(C_n)_{F,V} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } V \notin F \\ 0 & \text{if } V \in F \end{cases}.$$

Since the slack matrix of the hypercube  $S(C_n)$  has  $2n$  rows we clearly have

$$\left( \frac{\nu_+^{[0]}(S(C_n))}{\|S(C_n)\|_F} \right)^2 \leq \text{rank}_+(S(C_n)) \leq 2n.$$

To show that we indeed have equality, we exhibit a particular feasible point  $W$  of the semidefinite program (11) and we show that this  $W$  satisfies  $(\langle S(C_n), W \rangle / \|S(C_n)\|_F)^2 = 2n$ .

Let

$$W = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n-1}}}(2S(C_n) - J). \quad (15)$$

Observe that  $W$  is the matrix obtained from  $S(C_n)$  by changing the ones into  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n-1}}}$  and zeros into  $-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n-1}}}$ . For this  $W$  we verify using a simple calculation that

$$\left( \frac{\langle S(C_n), W \rangle}{\|S(C_n)\|_F} \right)^2 = 2n.$$

It thus remains to prove that  $W$  is indeed a feasible point of the semidefinite program (11) and that the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^\top & I \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2n+2^n) \times (2n+2^n)}$$

can be written as the sum of a nonnegative matrix and a positive semidefinite one. This is the main part of the proof and for this we introduce some notations. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the set of facets of the hypercube, and  $\mathcal{V} = \{0, 1\}^n$  be the set of vertices. If  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  is a facet of the hypercube, we denote by  $\overline{F}$  the opposite facet to  $F$  (namely, if  $F$  is given by  $x_k \geq 0$ , then  $\overline{F}$  is the facet  $x_k \leq 1$  and vice-versa). Similarly for a vertex  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  we denote by  $\overline{V}$  the opposite vertex obtained by negating the binary word  $V$ . Denote by  $N_{\mathcal{F}} : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $N_{\mathcal{V}} : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}$  the “negation” maps, so that we have:

$$\forall g \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{F}}, \forall F \in \mathcal{F}, (N_{\mathcal{F}}g)(F) = g(\overline{F}) \quad (16)$$

$$\forall h \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}}, \forall V \in \mathcal{V}, (N_{\mathcal{V}}h)(V) = h(\overline{V}) \quad (17)$$

Note that in a suitable ordering of the facets and the vertices, the matrix representation of  $N_{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $N_{\mathcal{V}}$  take the following antidiagonal form ( $N_{\mathcal{F}}$  is of size  $2n \times 2n$  and  $N_{\mathcal{V}}$  is of size  $2^n \times 2^n$ ):

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & 1 \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ 1 & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Consider now the following decomposition of the matrix  $\begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^\top & I \end{bmatrix}$ :

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & -W \\ -W^\top & I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} N_{\mathcal{F}} & 0 \\ 0 & N_{\mathcal{V}} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} I - N_{\mathcal{F}} & -W \\ -W^\top & I - N_{\mathcal{V}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (18)$$

Clearly the first matrix in the decomposition is nonnegative. The next lemma states that the second matrix is actually positive semidefinite:

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  be respectively the set of facets and vertices of the hypercube  $C_n = [0, 1]^n$  and let  $\widehat{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{V}}$  be the matrix:*

$$\widehat{W}_{F,V} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } V \notin F \\ -1 & \text{if } V \in F \end{cases} \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{F}, V \in \mathcal{V}$$

Then the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} I - N_{\mathcal{F}} & -\gamma \widehat{W} \\ -\gamma \widehat{W}^{\top} & I - N_{\mathcal{V}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (19)$$

is positive semidefinite for  $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{2^{n-1}}$  (where  $N_{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $N_{\mathcal{V}}$  are defined in (16) and (17)).

*Proof.* We use the Schur complement to show that the matrix (19) is positive semidefinite. In fact we show that

1.  $I - N_{\mathcal{V}} \succeq 0$
2.  $\text{range}(\widehat{W}^{\top}) \subseteq \text{range}(I - N_{\mathcal{V}})$ , and
3.  $I - N_{\mathcal{F}} - \gamma^2 \widehat{W}(I - N_{\mathcal{V}})^{-1} \widehat{W}^{\top} \succeq 0$ .

where  $(I - N_{\mathcal{V}})^{-1}$  denotes the pseudo-inverse of  $I - N_{\mathcal{V}}$ .

Observe that for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , the  $2k \times 2k$  matrix given by:

$$I_{2k} - N_{2k} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & -1 \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & \\ -1 & & & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

is positive semidefinite: in fact  $\frac{1}{2}(I_{2k} - N_{2k})$  is the orthogonal projection onto the subspace spanned by its columns (i.e., the subspace of dimension  $k$  spanned by  $\{e_i - e_{2k-i} : i = 1, \dots, k\}$  where  $e_i$  is the  $i$ 'th unit vector). Hence this shows that  $I - N_{\mathcal{V}}$  is positive semidefinite, and it also shows that  $(I - N_{\mathcal{V}})^{-1} = \frac{1}{4}(I - N_{\mathcal{V}})$ .

Now we show that  $\text{range}(\widehat{W}^{\top}) \subseteq \text{range}(I - N_{\mathcal{V}})$ . For any  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ , the  $F$ 'th column of  $\widehat{W}^{\top}$  satisfies  $(\widehat{W}^{\top})_{V,F} = -(\widehat{W}^{\top})_{\overline{V},F}$  for any  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ , and thus  $\text{range}(\widehat{W}^{\top}) \subseteq \text{span}(e_V - e_{\overline{V}} : V \in \mathcal{V}) = \text{range}(I - N_{\mathcal{V}})$ .

It thus remains to show that

$$I - N_{\mathcal{F}} - \gamma^2 \widehat{W}(I - N_{\mathcal{V}})^{-1} \widehat{W}^{\top} \succeq 0$$

First note that since  $\frac{1}{2}(I - N_{\mathcal{V}})$  is an orthogonal projection and that  $\text{range}(\widehat{W}^{\top}) \subseteq \text{range}(I - N_{\mathcal{V}})$ , we have  $(I - N_{\mathcal{V}})^{-1} \widehat{W}^{\top} = \frac{1}{2} \widehat{W}^{\top}$ . Thus we now have to show that

$$I - N_{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\gamma^2}{2} \widehat{W} \widehat{W}^{\top} \succeq 0.$$

The main observation here is that the matrix  $\widehat{W} \widehat{W}^{\top}$  is actually equal to  $2^n(I - N_{\mathcal{F}})$ . For any  $F, G \in \mathcal{F}$ , we have:

$$(\widehat{W} \widehat{W}^{\top})_{F,G} = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}} \widehat{W}_{F,a} \widehat{W}_{G,a} = \begin{cases} 2^n & \text{if } F = G \\ -2^n & \text{if } F = \overline{G} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Clearly if  $F = G$ , then  $(\widehat{W}\widehat{W}^\top)_{F,G} = 2^n$ . Also if  $F = \overline{G}$  then  $(\widehat{W}\widehat{W}^\top)_{F,G} = -2^n$  (since if  $F = \overline{G}$  then  $a \in F \Leftrightarrow a \notin G$  hence  $\widehat{W}_{F,a}\widehat{W}_{G,a} = -1$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{V}$ ). In the case that  $F \neq G$  and  $F \neq \overline{G}$ , it is easy to verify by simple counting that  $\sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}} \widehat{W}_{F,a}\widehat{W}_{G,a} = 0$ .

Hence we have  $I - N_{\mathcal{F}} - \gamma^2 \widehat{W}(I - N_{\mathcal{V}})^{-1} \widehat{W}^\top = I - N_{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\gamma^2}{2} \widehat{W}\widehat{W}^\top = (1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2} 2^n)(I - N_{\mathcal{F}})$  which is positive semidefinite for  $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{2^{n-1}}$ . □

Using this lemma, Equation (18) shows that the matrix  $W$  is feasible for the semidefinite program (11), and thus that  $\nu_+^{[0]}(S(C_n)) \geq \langle S(C_n), W \rangle = \sqrt{2^{n-1}} \cdot 2n$ . Hence since  $\|S(C_n)\|_F = \sqrt{2^{n-1} \cdot 2n}$  we get that

$$\text{rank}_+(S(C_n)) \geq \left( \frac{\nu_+^{[0]}(S(C_n))}{\|S(C_n)\|_F} \right)^2 \geq \left( \frac{\sqrt{2^{n-1}} \cdot 2n}{\sqrt{2^{n-1} \cdot 2n}} \right)^2 = 2n$$

which completes the proof. □

## References

- [BSM03] A. Berman and N. Shaked-Monderer. *Completely positive matrices*. World Scientific Pub Co Inc, 2003. [3](#)
- [CR93] J.E. Cohen and U.G. Rothblum. Nonnegative ranks, decompositions, and factorizations of nonnegative matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 190:149–168, 1993. [12](#)
- [Dür10] M. Dür. Copositive programming—a survey. *Recent Advances in Optimization and its Applications in Engineering*, pages 3–20, 2010. [3](#)
- [FKPT11] S. Fiorini, V. Kaibel, K. Pashkovich, and D.O. Theis. Combinatorial bounds on nonnegative rank and extended formulations. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1111.0444*, 2011. [2](#), [4](#), [13](#)
- [FMP<sup>+</sup>12] S. Fiorini, S. Massar, S. Pokutta, H.R. Tiwary, and R. de Wolf. Linear vs. semidefinite extended formulations: exponential separation and strong lower bounds. In *Proceedings of the 44th Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 95–106. ACM, 2012. [17](#)
- [GPT11] J. Gouveia, P.A. Parrilo, and R. Thomas. Lifts of convex sets and cone factorizations. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1111.3164*, 2011. [17](#)
- [GRT12] J. Gouveia, R.Z. Robinson, and R.R. Thomas. Polytopes of minimum positive semidefinite rank. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1205.5306*, 2012. [13](#)
- [Jam87] G.J.O. Jameson. *Summing and nuclear norms in Banach space theory*, volume 8. Cambridge Univ Pr, 1987. [6](#)

- [JSWZ12] R. Jain, Y. Shi, Z. Wei, and S. Zhang. Correlation/communication complexity of generating bipartite states. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1203.1153*, 2012. [2](#), [17](#)
- [KN06] E. Kushilevitz and N. Nisan. *Communication Complexity*. Cambridge University Press, 2006. [2](#)
- [KP02] E. Klerk and D.V. Pasechnik. Approximation of the stability number of a graph via copositive programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 12(4):875–892, 2002. [11](#)
- [Löf04] J. Löfberg. YALMIP: A toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB. In *Proceedings of the CACSD Conference*, Taipei, Taiwan, 2004. [10](#)
- [Löf09] J. Löfberg. Pre- and post-processing sum-of-squares programs in practice. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(5):1007–1011, 2009. [10](#)
- [Lov90] L. Lovász. Communication complexity: A survey. *Paths, Flows, and VLSI-Layout*, page 235, 1990. [2](#)
- [LS09] T. Lee and A. Shraibman. *Lower bounds in communication complexity*. Now Publishers Inc, 2009. [2](#)
- [Par00] P.A. Parrilo. *Structured Semidefinite Programs and Semialgebraic Geometry Methods in Robustness and Optimization*. PhD thesis, California Institute of Technology, 2000. [3](#), [9](#)
- [Vav09] S.A. Vavasis. On the complexity of nonnegative matrix factorization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(3):1364–1377, 2009. [2](#)
- [Yan91] M. Yannakakis. Expressing combinatorial optimization problems by linear programs. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 43(3):441–466, 1991. [2](#), [13](#)
- [Zha10] S. Zhang. Quantum strategic game theory. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1012.5141*, 2010. [2](#)